

□ 1915

ADMINISTRATION GETS TWO THUMBS DOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, the holiday movie season usually begins each year around Christmas Day, but this year the holiday movie season has begun early. It began this week, in fact, when the administration premiered its new movie entitled, "Iraq: The Sequel."

As you will recall, the first Iraq movie began with the administration warning us about weapons of mass destruction and mushroom clouds. Then we invaded Iraq where we discovered that the weapons of mass destruction didn't exist. But the administration kept coming up with new reasons to keep the occupation going.

The American people gave this first Iraq two thumbs down, but that hasn't discouraged our leaders in the White House. They have been busy writing the same exact script for "Iraq: The Sequel," which is all about Iran.

In this movie, the administration warns us about Iranian weapons of mass destruction, in this case a nuclear weapons program. Then it gives us new visions of mushroom clouds by warning us about World War III. Then we discover, as we did last week, that the nuclear weapons program does not exist. In fact, it was suspended back in 2003. But the administration continues to come up with new reasons to keep the crisis going.

Yesterday we were told that Iran was dangerous, Iran is dangerous, Iran will be dangerous. So the administration's drumbeat for war in general, and against Iran in particular, goes on. Before we go back to the dark days, Madam Speaker, the dark days of shock and awe, I have a few questions to ask.

First, why did it take 4 long years to discover the truth about the Iranian nuclear weapons program? Was this another example of intelligence being manipulated for political purposes?

Why did the administration warn us in October that Iranian nuclear weapons could start World War III when the Director of National Intelligence went to the White House in August to say that Iran's nuclear weapons system "may be suspended"?

There is nothing, nothing more reckless and irresponsible than to terrify the world about World War III when there is no basis for it.

Why did the administration continue to use threatening language yesterday? Yesterday, when the truth was already known. Instead of looking for opportunities for peace, this administration continues to look for ways to keep tensions as high as possible.

My last question, Madam Speaker, is why does the administration seem so intent on wrecking America's credi-

bility? By doing so, this administration has made the world a much more dangerous place and has undercut our own national security. We are like the boy who cries wolf. No one will believe what we say now, and that means we cannot lead the world effectively against terrorism and towards peace.

The movies of "Iraq" and "Iraq: The Sequel" have both bombed. We need a new plot, a plot that begins with responsible redeployment of our troops out of Iraq, which would be the essential, responsible first step.

When we do that, we can begin to bring together all the parties in the region that have a stake in keeping a lid on violence and reducing tensions. We must change course because that is the only way to regain the moral leadership. And we must reshape events, and we must reshape them in ways that are favorable to the United States and to peace around the world.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1201

Mr. PICKERING. Madam Speaker, I would like to ask unanimous consent to withdraw my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 1201.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

EYE ON THE SUPREME COURT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, last week hundreds of citizens stood in the first snow of winter in Washington, D.C. for 2 hours, hoping to get a coveted seat in the United States Supreme Court building to see the oral arguments on the case of the detainees in Guantanamo prisoner of war camp and what rights, if any, they have under our Constitution; however, the Supreme Court gallery has a mere 50 seats for spectators.

One of those would-be viewers was a lawyer on my staff, Gina Santucci. I wanted her there to find out more about the case and take notes. But she, like most of the people in line, never got in to see the arguments. There was no room in the room. Those that were allowed into the proceedings were only permitted to stay 5 minutes before they had to leave and make room for other people in the room.

Public interest in what takes place in the Supreme Court is a good thing. It is important that Americans are concerned about what occurs in the Supreme Court, and citizens want to observe the most powerful court in action anywhere in the world. But most Americans will never have this opportunity to see the questions asked by the Justices of the Supreme Court or to hear the arguments over the meaning of our Constitution or hear con-

stitutional cases that will go down in history.

Earlier this year, I introduced H.R. 1299 to allow television cameras to televise Supreme Court proceedings. Since then, both the House and the Senate Judiciary Committees have heard arguments as to why cameras should be allowed inside the Supreme Court.

Last week, the Senate Judiciary Committee marked up Senator SPECTER's bill to allow cameras in the Supreme Court. Some Senators were concerned that the Department of Justice opposed this bill. Justice Department opposed this bill because they say they want to protect the "collegial environment" of the Court. I don't mean to intrude on what a "collegial environment" is, but what is it?

I thought the business before the Supreme Court is a matter the American people have an interest in, not just the college of lawyers that appear before the court.

We have cameras in these House Chambers, and I never thought about whether the camera here on the House floor affects the collegiality between the fellow representatives that we work with. Most of us hardly notice the camera at all. And today's cameras are so small and unobtrusive, they are not noticed. They don't affect our daily routine here in the House, but they allow Americans across the vastness of the fruited plain to tune in to see what their government is up to every day.

Now, I doubt if the Supreme Court TV channel will win the fall sweeps, but it will allow Americans who live in the 50 States to observe the oral arguments that take place. Some say they are against cameras in the courtroom because attorneys play to the camera and try to impress the viewing audience.

Madam Speaker, attorneys don't play to the camera, they play to the jury. I know because I played to the jury for 8 years as a prosecutor in Texas. However, there isn't even a jury to impress in the Supreme Court. In fact, there really isn't a time to grandstand in the Supreme Court. Oral arguments in the Supreme Court involve the best appellate attorneys in the country, facing a spew of questions from nine Justices who are asking a barrage of legal questions to these lawyers making them justify their legal positions on their case.

I only explain how the oral arguments work in the Supreme Court because most Americans are unaware of the proceedings and the procedures since they don't have the opportunity to view Supreme Court oral arguments personally. Unless there are cameras, Americans will never have the chance to see what takes place in a courtroom, the most powerful courtroom in the whole world, the Supreme Court courtroom.

I know cameras can be placed in a courtroom without disruption or distraction because I did it. For 22 years,

I served as a felony court judge in Houston, Texas. I heard over 25,000 criminal cases and a thousand jury trials. Some of those were filmed by the TV media. I even televised a capital murder trial. My rules were simple and always obeyed by the media: No filming of rape victims, children, the jury, or certain other witnesses. The camera filmed what the jury saw and heard. And, Madam Speaker, I had no problem with the media at all. We need to let the public see a real trial in progress, and cameras have made that possible.

Americans have the right to watch Supreme Court proceedings in person. We have the best judicial system ever created in the history of the world. Why not prove it by filming these proceedings? Americans should not be deprived of the right to observe just because they cannot physically sit in the Supreme Court courtroom. It is time to remove the veil of secrecy from the hallowed halls of the Supreme Court and allow cameras to film these important proceedings.

Justice would be better served if we open the doors to the Supreme Court to cameras because justice is the one thing we should always find.

And that's just the way it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CUMMINGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

JOSH MILLER HEARTS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SUTTON. Madam Speaker, there are no words to describe the pain we feel when a young life is lost.

To know Josh Miller was to know a kindhearted and generous young man with limitless potential. Josh was a Baberton High School sophomore with a 4.0 grade point average, a linebacker who dreamed of playing football for Ohio State one day.

But one day, without warning, these dreams were cut short. Josh had never shown any signs of heart trouble, but during the final game of the 2000 football season, he collapsed after leaving the field. By the time his heart was shocked with an automated external defibrillator, it was too late to save him.

Josh suffered a sudden cardiac arrest, which, according to the American Heart Association, claims the lives of about 330,000 Americans every year. The vast majority of these individuals, like Josh, will not have displayed any signs of heart trouble beforehand; yet there is an easy-to-use, relatively inexpensive piece of medical equipment that can more than double the odds of

survival for someone experiencing such a sudden cardiac arrest.

An automated external defibrillator, or AED, is the single-most effective treatment for starting the heart after sudden cardiac arrest. And because chances of survival decrease up to 10 percent for every minute that passes, every second is critical.

It is incredibly important that we take steps to educate the public about the life-and-death difference that using these devices would make. I would like to thank and to commend my colleague, Mr. KUHLMAN, for his efforts in promoting increased access to AEDs through the resolution passed this afternoon. Later this week, I will be introducing a piece of legislation that takes another step to increase the ability of AEDs in our communities.

The Josh Miller HEARTS Act will establish a grant program that will help schools across the country purchase these lifesaving devices. Schools are central gathering places in our communities, and placing AEDs in our schools will not only save the lives of students enrolled there, potentially, but they will be available for teachers and staff, parents and volunteers, and the many other members of the community who pass through the halls every single day.

This legislation will be modeled on a similar program recently completed in the State of Ohio. Dr. Terry Gordon, a cardiologist at Akron General Hospital, has dedicated his life to this campaign. And his tireless efforts in Ohio led to the adoption of a statewide initiative to put an AED into every school across the State. Already, this program has saved the lives of 12 children and adults as a direct result.

I hope we in Congress can build on Dr. Gordon's good work and carry out this program at the national level. Losing a young life full of promise, like Josh's, can bring about a sense of helplessness. But today, we have an opportunity to act. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this effort to bring AEDs into every single school across this country.

□ 1930

HONORING THE U.S. MARINE CORPS' DECISION TO ALLOW FAMILY OF FALLEN MARINE TO ADOPT SON'S K-9 PARTNER, LEX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, too often during wartime, tragedy takes center stage and heart-warming stories never get told. Tonight I would like to share a truly touching story with my colleagues in the House and with the American people.

Corporal Dustin Jerome Lee was a United States Marine Corps working-dog handler who was killed in action

on March 21, 2007, in Fallujah, Iraq. Corporal Lee and his canine partner, Lex, a 7-year-old German shepherd from Camp Lejeune were a highly trained explosives detection team. Lex, who was due for retirement after his combat tour in Iraq, suffered shrapnel wounds from the same enemy-fired rocket-propelled grenade that took Corporal Lee's life.

Following Corporal Lee's death, the Lee family began seeking to adopt their son's canine companion who was with their son during the last moments on Earth. However, after filing the necessary paperwork, contacts at Marine Corps Logistic Base Albany indicated that Lex had been medically evaluated and, although injured, was fit for duty and not yet eligible for adoption.

I first learned of the Lee family's situation by reading the short story, "My Partner Dustin," written by John Burnam, author of "Dog Tags of Courage."

Madam Speaker, at this time I will submit the text of the story for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

MY PARTNER DUSTIN
(By John C. Burnam)

I'm a U.S. Marine and the primary element of a two-member team trained to hunt and locate explosives. My partner and I trained as a team for many months honing our expertise to save American lives in the War on Terrorism in Iraq.

The date is March 21, 2007 and I was on the job in Fallujah, Iraq when an enemy fired Rocket Propelled Grenade (RPG) exploded in our midst. I was blasted to the ground. I'm Stunned. My head is ringing and my body feels numb. My eyes can't quite focus on anything.

My partner is lying next to me severely wounded and bleeding. I move to him and touch him but he's not responding. I feel sharp pains in my side and back. I'm bleeding but deal with it and concentrate on comforting my partner and protecting him from further harm.

Everything happened so fast that it caused disorientation and confusion. My senses pick up the lingering smell of burnt powder and smoke from the explosion. I hear lots of American voices and heavy boot-steps hurrying all around us. They reach our location and immediately attend to my partner. And then they carry him away. I'm separated from my partner for the first time. I'm not clear of thought and then I too am carried away but to a different hospital.

I'm in a building lying on a table with lights above and people talking. Still dazed and confused I hear a strange voice say my name, "Lex!" I gesture a slight reflex of acknowledgement. "Lex! You are going to be okay buddy! Just lay still. We are going to take care of your hurts, so stay calm okay, Lex?" My eyes dart around the room searching for my partner, but he's not there and no one can interpret my thoughts.

I'm released from the hospital and well enough to travel so they transfer me from Iraq to a U.S. Marine Corp base in Albany, Georgia. I really miss my partner, Dusty. I know something has happened to him because he would never have left me alone for so long.

Yes, my name is Lex. I'm a seven year old German shepherd Military Working Dog. My master and loyal partner is Corporal Dustin Jerome Lee, U.S. Marine Corps canine handler from Mississippi. I'm well disciplined to